

COPY OF THE RECLAMATION PLAN AND VARIANCE SUMMARY  
ATTACHED TO THE DIVISION'S NOV. 30, 1994 LETTER.

5/19/95 *ag*

0004

ATTACHMENT ONE  
M/021/008

ISSUES RAISED IN GENEVA'S  
JAN. 20, 1995 LETTER ARE  
HIGHLIGHTED HERE.

In order to clarify the reclamation requirements for various areas, the variances granted, and which portions of the mine sites these variances apply to, the Division provides the following section. This section has been formatted to match the order listed under section 12.2 of Geneva Steel's September 9, 1994 revised text, of the consolidated NOI submission. References to support or negate the variances listed in that section are included. The text taken from Geneva's submission is shown in *italicized* print.

12.2.1 M/021/008 AND M/021/003 [Original USX Properties]  
Reclamation Standards:

M/021/003 Desert Mound operations

This site was originally permitted by US Steel and later purchased by USX. Areas included in this permit were the Mtn. Lion Pit, Mtn. Lion Dumps, Yellow Jacket Pit, proposed Homestake Pit, and Blackhawk Fines. Portions of the site (Mtn. Lion Pit, Mtn Lion Dumps, Blackhawk Fines) were later transferred to Geneva Steel.

1. *Pits: Open pits will be left open, except the Yellow Jacket Pit, which will be partially filled with overburden material. A six foot high safety rick of run of mine waste rock will be dumped around all pit perimeters for safety purposes. On lower 2 bench levels where room is adequate, rocky rubble will be pushed to lower level of the pit, and areas bumped up from shooting will be smoothed out. 2-3 inches of topsoil will be placed on lower 2 benches where feasible and seeded. Lower level of pit would be allowed to form a natural lake.*

→ Item 1 (above), in this section is found in file M/021/003, Executive Summary, November 13, 1981, Mining and Reclamation Plan, After Operations section, item 1. Therefore, these statements apply specifically to the Mtn. Lion Pit and Mtn. Lion Pit benches. *GENEVA: HOMESTAKE PIT + DUMPS SHOULD BE INCLUDED.*

2. *Waste Dumps: Dump crests will be rounded when through in conformance with surrounding topography. Dump tops will be contour scarified and reseeded. The maximum grading slope was set as 40°.*

→ Item 2 (above), appears to be paraphrased from file M/021/003, US Steel January 27, 1977 letter, item 11, pages three and four. These statements apply specifically to the Mtn. Lion Dumps.

3. *Topsoil: No topsoil recovery required as no significant recoverable topsoil exists.*

Item 3, could not be found as stated above, in files M/021/003 or M/021/008. File M/021/003, Executive Summary November 13, 1981, under the heading of Soils includes the statement "No topsoil was stockpiled from previous activity and very little useable material exists to cover waste rock." A majority of the Desert Mound site involves pre-law areas where no topsoil was salvaged prior to operations. The Division will not require topsoil salvage for those pre-law areas, specifically the Mtn. Lion Pit, Mtn Lion Dump, and Blackhawk Fines. The Division will require topsoil salvage on new areas which do not exist on pre-law disturbances.

4. *Revegetation: A. Soil treatment: Soil treatment will consist of mulching or contour scarifying on sloping areas, drilling only on flat areas with depth depending on degree of compaction. Ammonium nitrate and phosphate fertilizer will be applied if necessary. B. Broadcast Seed Mix {not included*

0004



5/19/95 *ag*

Page 2  
Attachment One  
M/021/008  
November 30, 1994

here} *Seed mix may be varied (species and/or rates) for each area at operator's discretion C. Planting will be in the fall with a one time application of water with water truck. Seeding efforts will be concentrated on areas where success is feasible. Seeding of mine dump slopes is not necessary.*

A statement similar to Item 4, A, is found in file M/021/003, Division letter of January 27, 1977, to US Steel. Page three, item 11, 3. states: "... State that soil treatment consisting of mulching, fertilizing, or contour scarifying will be performed depending on test plots."

A statement similar to Item 4, B is found in the same file, Division letter of February 16, 1984, to US Steel, page 5, item 8.5 "The operator may want to vary the seed mix (species and/or rates) used for each area to be revegetated (mine dump vs. haul roads vs. office area, etc.). ... "

A comment similar to item 4, C is also found in the February 16, 1984 letter, page five, item 8.2 "Seeding efforts should be concentrated on those areas where success is feasible (e.g. flat topped areas, haul roads, etc.). Seeding of mine dump slopes, if extremely rocky, will probably result in seeding failure and unnecessary cost." The Division adds the clarification to statement 4 C, that seeding of mine dump slopes is not necessary **if the dump slopes are extremely rocky**. This would apply to portions of a dump slope or the entire slope. This applies to the Mtn. Lion Dumps as permitted in M/021/003.

The Division has no concerns with items 5 through 8 of this portion of Geneva's submission with respect to the M/021/003 permit areas.

#### M/021/008 Iron Mountain operations

Original permit by US Steel included the **Blackhawk Loadout, Lean Ore Pile and Lean Ore Dump. The Blackhawk Pit, New Tails Basin and Blackhawk Fines** were later amended into this permit. US Steel later became known as Geneva Steel.

Reclamation requirements for these areas are summarized in the July 7, 1986, Notice of Tentative Approval which states in the After Operations section: "(1) The reject waste pile will be sloped to less than a 40° angle. (2) The disturbed area will be scarified and seeded. (3) All roads except those currently needed for access to private property will be scarified and seeded." Additional descriptions of the reclamation treatments may be found in the US Steel letter received April 17, 1986.

#### Variances:

1. *Open pits do not require reseeding or regrading, and will be left in place (Rule M-10(3,13)).*

→ Division file M/021/003 March 12, 1985 memo, page two, item 2.1, 2.2.3, in reference to the Mtn. Lion Pit states: "A variance to Rule M-10(3) may be granted providing that the operator agrees to monitor the level on a monthly basis and submit the information as part of the annual report and that no problems are apparent during the bond release period." Reclamation standard M-10(3) Impoundments states: "All evaporation, tailings, and sediment ponds; spoil piles, fills, pads and regraded areas shall be self-draining and non-impounding when abandoned unless previously approved as an impounding facility by a lawful state or federal agency." No documentation of a variance to M-10(13) Dams could be found, although a variance to this rule would be implied by the variance to M-10(3). The M-10(3) variance allows the Mtn. Lion Pit to remain as an impounding feature, which implies that no regrading or seeding of the pit is required. No documentation specifically dealing with regrading or seeding of the pits could be found in M/021/003 or M/021/008.

*SEE GENEVA 1/20/95  
LETTER PAGE 2*

2. *Some haul roads will serve as livestock ranching access for post-mine use.*



5/19/95 *902*

The Division has a concern with this statement due to the lack of specific identification of the haul roads referred to.

3. *70% revegetation standard has been waived. Operator is required to establish a minimum cover of beneficial vegetation, if possible. If operator has used practical methods which are those specified in the permit (scarifying and reseeding) and minimal cover of beneficial vegetation is not met, this standard is also waived.*

→ This statement, as stated above, could not be found in file M/021/003 or file M/021/008. A similar statement was found in file M/021/001, Division letter October 13, 1981. Since that letter would only apply to areas under permit M/021/001 it does not apply here. *SEE GENEVA 1/20/95 LETTER PAGE 2*

4. *Topsoil recovery not required.*

→ This statement could not be found in file M/021/003 or M/021/008 as stated here; however, it may have been paraphrased. Executive Summary, M/021/003, November 13, 1981, states under the Soils category "... No topsoil was stockpiled from previous activity and very little useable material exists to cover the waste rock." In file M/021/008 the Division's October 24, 1990 response letter to Geneva Steel regarding a permit revision, page 4, item 7 states: "The operator must develop and describe a plan for the salvaging and redistribution of topsoil or substitute soil material on all areas to be disturbed on site. Areas which were disturbed pre-law are exempt from topsoil salvage. However, it will be necessary to develop alternative methods to construct viable plant growing mediums in these areas, i.e. the use of substitute material and soil amendments, such as mulches and fertilizer. ..." Item 4 would be more appropriately written to describe the lack of topsoil salvaged on pre-law areas, but the requirement to salvage topsoil from areas which are outside of the pre-law disturbances. *SEE GENEVA 1/20/95 LETTER PAGE 2*

5. *Waste dumps may be placed in natural drainage channels.*

This statement could not be found in file M/021/003 or M/021/008. A variance request for this type of activity was found in file M/021/001, however, that would not apply to the areas described by M/021/003 and M/021/008.

#### 12.2.2 M/021/005 [Original CF&I Properties]

Permit M/021/005 includes the Comstock Pit (and Comstock Dump?), the Blowout's Lean Ore Dumps, and the Duncan Pit.

#### Reclamation Standards:

The Division has no comments on items 1 and 2 under this section of Geneva's submission.

3. *Topsoil: No topsoil recovery required as no significant recoverable topsoil exists.*

Executive Summary, M/021/005, April 18, 1980, page four states: "Due to the lack of large amounts of topsoil, the revegetation philosophy will be to treat waste dump material by using such methods as scarifying, using mulch and fertilizing, to develop a suitable plant support medium."

The Division has no comments on items 4, 5, 6, and 7 under this section of Geneva's submission.



5/19/95 aag

Page 4  
Attachment One  
M/021/008  
November 30, 1994

*Variances:*

*1. Open pits do not require reseeding or regrading.*

This statement could not be found in file M/021/005; however, no documentation to negate this statement could be found either. The file does acknowledge that the pits are pre-law which would imply that reclamation (in general) of the pits is not required unless they have been re-impacted.

*2. Some access roads will serve as livestock ranching access for post-mine use.*

This statement could not be found in file M/021/005. The April 1980 Public Notice, After Operations section, item 5 states: "Compacted surfaces such as access roads will be scarified and graded to a smooth contour and revegetated." The livestock ranching roads within this permit area will need to be identified for the Division to consider the post-mine use.

*3. 70% revegetation standard has been waived but vegetation cover should be attempted where possible. If operator has used practical methods which are those specified in the permit the revegetation standard has been met.*

→ This statement could not be found in file M/021/005. A similar statement was found in M/021/001 which would not apply to the areas under permit M/021/005. *SEE GENEVA 1/20/95 LETTER PAGE 3*

*4. Topsoil recovery not required.*

Division file memo of August 27, 1982, page two states: "The last area of concern at the Comstock pit was the proposed extension of the waste rock dump to the south. Apparently, no topsoil need be saved as a commitment was not obtained in the original MRP. The area is covered by Pinion-Juniper and may have minimal soil depth. However, considering the success rate of revegetation on the waste rock, even a little soil would be an aid. It was suggested to the operator that soil be saved if possible."

The Division's inspection memo in file M/021/008 dated October 22, 1990, raised the issue of salvaging topsoil in front of the advancing toe of the Comstock dump. Geneva indicated they had no plans for pre-stripping the soils and would follow the approved CF&I permit. Geneva was planning on using the material from the "ant hills" as soil material for reclamation of the dumps.

The Division's inspection memo in file M/021/005 dated November 16, 1990, allowed Geneva to use the material from the ant hill area as soil substitute on the Comstock dump slopes as long as the material proved to be of similar texture and nutrient content as the soils found in front of the dumps.

*12.2.3 M/021/001 [Original Utah International, Inc. Properties]*

Areas relevant to the current consolidated permit being submitted by Geneva which were covered under Permit M/021/001 include the **Yellow Jacket Pit and Waste Dump**, the **Comstock Plant Site and Railroad Spur**.



5/19/95 *aa*

1. *Reclamation Standards:*

The Division has no comment on item 1 under this section of the Geneva submission.

2. *Topsoiling: No topsoil recovery required.*

This statement could not be found in file M/021/001. The M/021/001 Public Notice dated August 25, 1978, under the During Operations section, item 2, states: "All soil from new disturbances will be stockpiled." The Executive Summary of May 28, 1980, Mining and Reclamation section, page three states: "Due to the lack of large amounts of topsoil, the revegetation philosophy will be to treat waste dump material by using such methods as scarifying, using mulch and fertilizing to develop a suitable plant support medium." The Division interprets the combination of these statements to mean no topsoil was salvaged from the pre-existing areas of disturbance; however, soil from new disturbances will be salvaged.

3. A. The Division has no comment on item 3 A under this section of the Geneva submission.

3 B. ... *Seed mix may be varied (species and/or rates) for each area at operator's discretion. Seeding by range drilling along the contour wherever topography permits, inaccessible areas will be broadcast seeded.*

→ This statement could not be found in file M/021/001. *SEE GENEVA 1/20/95 LETTER PAGE 3*

4. The Division has no comment on item 4 under this section of the Geneva submission.

5. *All surface debris will either be buried or removed from the site.*

Public Notice M/021/001 August 25, 1978, After Operations section, item 2 states: "All equipment, scrap, debris and unusable buildings will be removed and disposed of in a sanitary landfill." This statement does not allow for onsite burial of debris associated with this permit.

*Variances:*

1. *Same (sic) haul roads will serve as livestock ranching access for post-mine use.*

This statement could not be found in file M/021/001. The Executive Summary of August 25, 1978, After Operations section, item 3 states: "Pads, dumps and unnecessary road (sic) will be scarified and seeded." The Division has a concern with this statement, since no description of the roads claimed to have a postmine use is provided.

2. *70% revegetation standard has been waived. Operator is required to establish (sic) a minimum cover of beneficial vegetation, if possible. If operator has used practical methods which are those specified in the permit and minimal cover of beneficial vegetation is not met, this standard is also waived.*

This statement could not be found in file M/021/001. A similar statement was found in the Division letter of October 13, 1981, to Utah International, Inc.. The letter is responding to a request by UII for reclamation release of areas visited during an April 29, 1981 field trip. Paragraph two of the letter states: "The Division will be able to issue a release from responsibility for reclamation of mine areas in part, according to rule M-10(12)(2)(b) and/or (3). Several areas for which you have requested release have not survived the three season requirements for revegetation. ... . Attempts (sic) at meeting revegetation standards will be taken into account if seventy percent



5/19/95 *and*

Page 6  
Attachment One  
M/021/008  
November 30, 1994

achievement is not attainable as per M-10(12)(3) and adequate efforts to achieve such are demonstrated by Utah International." The Division's statement does not waive the 70% revegetation standard for all areas listed under permit M/021/001. The statement allows the Division to consider releasing an area which has received adequate reclamation efforts, but does not satisfy the 70% revegetation standard.

3. *Highwall and natural drainage blocking variance.*

Executive Summary, May 28, 1980, under Mining and Reclamation section states: "Utah International requests variances for Rule M-10(5) and (8). Rule M-10(5) is for highwalls and Rule M-10(8) is for natural drainage blockage. Both of these variances were approved by the Board for the Cedar City operations previously. These variances allow for highwalls steeper than 45° to remain and allow drainages to be obstructed by mine features." These variances would apply to those areas included in the M/021/001 permit.

4. *Post-mine use of plant site as industrial plant site (modification currently requested). Geneva anticipates using the plant site as a future industrial site. Some projects currently under consideration are a steel plate warehouse and a pelletizing plant. Although some years away, Geneva considers the location of this area ideal for industrial use because of its accessibility to rail lines and highways.*

This is a new variance request for the Comstock Plant. In the public notice published for M/021/001 dated August 17, 1978, under the section titled "After Operations" Item 2 states: "All equipment, scrap, debris and unusable buildings will be removed and disposed of in a sanitary landfill." At the present time, the Division agrees the utilization of this area as an industrial plant site is possible; however, an unlimited time frame for these possible future uses of the site is unacceptable to the Division. This variance is not granted at this time since these possible post-mine uses will not take place within the five year reclamation plan period which will be covered by the reclamation surety. The Division will consider the worst case scenario of dismantling and reclamation of the plant site for the reclamation surety calculations. Geneva may propose the industrial plant site variance when the surety is updated as part of the five year review, or when definitive time frames or purchase agreements are made for these facilities.

The Division has no comments on section 12.2.4 S/021/010 [Excelsior/Chesapeake] of Geneva's submission.

12.3 RECLAMATION PLAN FOR AREAS UNDER APPLICATION (Tip Top, Excelsior/Chesapeake Extension, Burke Pit Road)

The Division considers the new areas to include the **Tip Top Pit, Tip Top Dumps, and Tip Top Access Road (FAA road expansion), Excelsior/Chesapeake Pit, Excelsior/Chesapeake Dumps, Excelsior/Chesapeake Road, and Burke Pit Road.**

*Reclamation Plan*

The Division has no comments on the items listed under this section of Geneva's submission.

*Requested Variances: (See also Variance Maps)*

The Division has no comment on item 1 under this heading.

2. *Highwall variance was granted in December 22, 1993 correspondence for modified pit faces, provided slope angle is not greater than 45°. Slope variances for regrading are requested on dump slopes due to the steep adjacent topography and lack of access to the dump slopes. (See Appendix F)*



5/19/95 aad

The Division December 22, 1993 letter to Geneva did not grant a variance for highwalls. Also, if highwalls are at an angle of 45° or less, no variance is required.

As stated in the Division's December 22, 1993 letter, variance requests must include: (1) the specific area which would be affected by the variance, (2) justification for the variance, and (3) alternate methods or measures to be utilized consistent with the Act. Since no particular dump slopes were identified, the Division will assume Geneva request a variance for all dump slopes included in the new areas. Since no specific rule number was given, the Division will assume Geneva request a variance from Rule R647-4-111.6 Slopes. This rule requires waste piles, spoil piles, and fills be regraded to a stable configuration and be sloped to minimize safety hazards and erosion while providing for successful revegetation. Geneva's justification for this variance request appears to be that the topography adjacent to the dump is steep and there is no access to the dump slopes. The Division will not require Geneva to regrade the Tip Top Dump Slopes, or the Excelsior/Chesapeake Dump Slopes. Attempts to grade these angle of repose dump slopes on the existing steep terrain would be a safety hazard. See comments in section R647-4-109.5 Actions to Mitigate Any Impacts.

*3. Revegetation variance on the pit highwalls was granted in the December 22, 1993 correspondence with conditions.*

On page 14, under R647-4-111(13), the Division's December 22, 1993 letter stated: "A variance to the 70% revegetation standard will be granted for the highwalls associated with the Tip Top, Excelsior/Chesapeake sites. However, this will not relieve Geneva from broadcasting or hydromulching the recommended seed mixture onto these pit areas."

*4. A revegetation variance is requested on the Pre-Act disturbed areas as specified on Pre-Act and Variance drawings.*

This comment regarding pre-act areas does not seem to belong in this section under the heading of Areas Under Application, i.e. new areas being added into the permit. Does this mean Geneva is requesting a new variance for these Pre-Act areas? Is this a request for a variance from applying any revegetation treatment to these areas? Is this a request for a variance from having to meet the 70% revegetation standard on these areas? As stated, the request in item 4 is too broad and too vague, and does not seem to apply to the new areas. The drawings in series IM-0100-3e, sheets 2 through 6 indicate that all disturbances covered by this consolidated permit have one or more variances granted or have one or more variances currently requested.

*5. Hole plugging requirement variance was granted for mined through holes in December 22, 1993 correspondence.*

The Division's December 22, 1993 letter stated: "The Division will grant a variance for R647-4-108 Hole Plugging Requirements for the plugging of any drill holes which are inaccessible because they have been mined through or are under water. This variance will not apply to drill holes which are accessible before, or at the time of final reclamation." (AAG)